

**IUPUI FC Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes of February 23, 2007**

Present: Y. Chen, A. De Tienne (chair), J. Dynlacht, S. Hamilton (Administrative liaison), J. Hehman, R. Osgood, M. Wagner (Executive Committee liaison), R. Yost  
Excused: B. Blazer-Yost, H. Besch, K. Robertson, U. Sukhatme, M. Wolf  
Absent: D. Agarwal, A. Barth, C. Bostrom, T. Cummins, S. Fox, R. Gunderman, R. Nickolson, K. Petsche, L. Riolo, L. Schwecke

1. De Tienne called the meeting to order at 2:12 P.M. in the meeting room of the Institute for American Thought (ES0014). The agenda was approved, and the minutes of the 17 November 2006 meeting were approved with no correction.

2. **THREE-YEAR REVIEW POLICY [UPDATE]**. De Tienne summarized the sequence of events that took place since the last committee meeting regarding that issue. The FAC's proposed policy was given first reading at the December 5 meeting of the IFC. Following that discussion it was revised and circulated among the Committee for further editing and revisions. The Committee voted to approve the revised text, which was again revised some more and then brought forward as an action item at the IFC. It ended up being brought up at the IFC's called meeting of January 16, 2007, where a quorum was achieved just in time for discussion (De Tienne handed out the relevant excerpt from the minutes of that IFC meeting). An attempt by some IUSM faculty to replace the policy with another version tailored to solve IUSM problems was soundly defeated. Discussion was a bit raucous, but the question was called, the motion carried, and the policy passed, though clearly not unanimously. De Tienne thanked the members of the committee for the work well done and its positive outcome.

3. **REPRESENTATION OF FULLTIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY [DISCUSSION ITEM]**. De Tienne handed out three documents to facilitate the discussion of how the Constitution and By-laws Committee chaired by Henry Karlson nullified the FAC motion regarding NTTF representation that the IFC approved unanimously in May 2006: the relevant excerpt from Molly Martin's summary of the 20 February 2007 meeting of the IFC, the full wording of the FAC's motion regarding IFC representation of NTT faculty, and a copy of Article 1 of both the IU Faculty Constitution and of the IUPUI Faculty Constitution. Wagner, Hehman, and Yost expressed their dismay most vocally and eloquently. Wagner reminded the Committee that she had worked for two years, as chair of the FAC, to craft and convince everyone to pass the NTTF motion, and that this outcome was most disappointing, especially in view of the fact that the IFC voted for it unanimously. [The motion simply stated: "Ten at-large representatives from the ranks of the non-tenure track faculty shall be elected to the IUPUI Faculty Council. No more than two representatives should come from the same school."] Karlson is on record for saying that he is in favor of the motion but finds it impossible to provide the language that is necessary to amend the IUPUI Faculty Constitution without causing a conflict with the IU Faculty Constitution to which the former is subordinate. One difficulty stems from the fact that Article 1 of the IU Faculty Constitution not only implies that NTTF are not properly called faculty because they are not tenure-track [the word "instructors" does not apply to them, but only to young tenure-track hires who have yet to complete their Ph.D., a category that no longer exists], but it also specifies that "voting members of individual campuses may extend voting privileges to others on matters of *individual campus significance*." Karlson argued at the IFC meeting that such a restriction is impossible to manage, both because there is no definition of "campus significance," and because even if there was, only he as chair of the C&B Committee, in consultation with the IFC Parliamentarian, would have to decide, on a case by case basis, whether any policy or resolution to be voted on could be viewed as a mat-

ter of campus significance, and if not, then voting procedures would become very complicated on the IFC floor. Karlson's recommendation was that the only way out of the impasse was to amend the IU Faculty Constitution first, and that IFC President Ng should discuss the matter with the UFC Agenda Committee. Our committee roundly criticized the views of the chair of the B&C Committee for his inability, bordering on unwillingness, to find an easier solution. De Tienne wrote a long message to Ng to provide him with a philosophical argument making the case that the motion did not require that the IU Faculty Constitution be amended (despite the fact that several aspects of that Constitution are seriously obsolete and in great need of thorough revamping). The argument relies on a definition of "individual" that is at once mathematical, logical, and metaphysical. There is also the fact that whatever the IFC Executive Committee decides to put on the agenda for an IFC meeting should ipso facto be viewed as a matter of IUPUI significance, no matter where it originates from and no matter its possible ramifications beyond the campus. De Tienne also criticized Karlson for thinking that he is the only person, apart from the Parliamentarian, in charge of interpreting the IU Faculty Constitution for the sake of the IFC. It is the UFC Faculty Governance Committee that should be approached, and it happens that UFC document U2-2007, which provides the names of UFC Committees members, indicates that this year's Faculty Governance Committee has only two members, both co-chairs: Julie Bobay (IUB) and our very own Jennifer Hehman. Hehman was pleased to hear the news, and agreed to discuss the whole issue with her co-chair. Wagner advised that we consult with other IUPUI law professors to get alternative interpretations, and she suggested Paul Galanti especially. IFC President Ng, at the last IFC meeting, did not charge our committee with any particular action, but De Tienne represented that we are free to act behind the scene and that we should do so as we pleased. IFC representation of lecturers and clinical faculty is at stake, and several of them have already expressed their vast disappointment (and our own Robert Yost, senior lecturer in biology, is one of them—he expressed his gratitude to the FAC's support of NTTF representation). Several things can be done. One is for us to study both the IUPUI Faculty Constitution and the IU Faculty Constitution and determine what needs to be changed to reflect current practices and wishes (there are indeed UFC-approved policies regarding NTTF that, on a Karlsonian view, would be unconstitutional), and then to lobby for it. Another is to prepare ourselves, if need be, to craft an amendment to the IU Faculty Constitution, and then to launch a campaign to convince the IUPUI voting faculty to bring a petition for constitutional amendment in front of the UFC (one way indeed of doing this is by bringing a petition supported by 15% of the IU voting faculty, and De Tienne surmises that the IUPUI voting faculty constitutes more than 15%). In the meanwhile, De Tienne is asking all members of our committee to email him comments and ideas for argumentation and action.

**4. STUDENTS SATISFACTION SURVEYS [DISCUSSION ITEM].** De Tienne invited Robert Yost to lead this discussion, which had already been postponed twice for lack of time at previous meetings. Several issues regarding students' teaching evaluations (which are summative, not formative) deserve to be considered (listed in the agenda as "quality and comprehensiveness of survey instrument, interpretation criteria, reliability, validity, purposes, legitimate and illegitimate uses"). Yost handed out examples of "Student Satisfaction Evaluations" forms for lectures, for recitations, and for laboratories that are used in the School of Science, and pointed out several problems stemming from how data (whether questions or numbers, especially "averages") are to be interpreted. In some schools, like his own, averages resulting from these evaluations spell out the life or death of instructors. A number of classically thorny issues were evoked by everyone: the tendency for such evaluations to degenerate into popularity contests (with attendant pedagogical ills that this may cause); the question of students' competence in conducting a fair evaluation of a teacher (many don't have the minimal critical skills for doing so meaningfully, and of course students tend to interpret questions in different ways); the fact that poor-performing students tend easily to project their failures on instructors; the impact of class size on evaluations: the smaller the class, the greater the tendency not to take the results seriously, especially if they are good;

students' fear to be identified; whether students ought to be given easy access to results of evaluations; etc. (everyone seems to have a rich stock of comments and anecdotes in this connection). Sharon Hamilton reminded us that normally student evaluation averages must be looked at over several semesters to be indicative of anything, and that they constitute only one among several factors in evaluating teaching excellence. This brought up the question of comparative weight to be given to student satisfaction surveys and to peer reviews. Different schools have developed different practices, if not policies, in that regard. Wagner mentioned that alumni could be surveyed as part of departmental peer-reviews of instructors: it takes years sometimes for students to develop an appreciation for certain courses they had to take. De Tienne mentioned that Dean Sukhatme is all in favor of teaching evaluations, and would like to see IUPUI adopt an all-electronic system as exists at IUB (the IU Bloomington Evaluation Services and Testing [BEST] oversees a course-instructor evaluation system called Multi-Op that is used by many IUB departments [<http://www.indiana.edu/~best/multiop/index.shtml>]), for this would save considerable time and money. One drawback of electronic systems is that students tend not to file their evaluations, but incentives such as conditional grade release can ensure larger return. Hamilton reminded that OPD's Center for Teaching and Learning provides teaching assessment services, and that FACET has developed a peer-review DVD. De Tienne remarked that there is a whole range of issues associated with teaching evaluations, a large portion of which don't fall within the charge of our committee but rather in that of Academic Affairs. As far as our committee is concerned, relevant issues have more to do with legitimate uses of the evaluations in reappointment decisions and in tenure dossiers, weight to be given to them, and access to results of evaluations. Hamilton agreed to investigate whether there exists any sort of document or policy developed by the Dean of the Faculties Office in the past that clarifies the role and limitations of students' teaching evaluations. Summing up the gist of the discussion, De Tienne identified the need to develop a document that defines the proper weight to be given to student satisfaction evaluations for reappointment and promotion and tenure. It was decided that a subcommittee headed by Robert Yost would be established to work on this document. Any member of the committee interested in joining this subcommittee should let Yost know (ryost@iupui.edu).

5. **NEW BUSINESS.** There was none.

6. **NEXT MEETING.** Scheduled on Friday, March 23, 2007, from 2 to 3:30 P.M.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 P.M.

Submitted by André De Tienne, 27 February 2007